

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 30, 2008. Claims 1, 7 and 8 are presented for examination, of which Claim 1 is in independent form. Claim 1 has been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, Claims 7 and 8 have been added, and Claims 2-6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. The canceled claims will not be mentioned further. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0085223 (*Bigi*). Applicant submits that Claim 1, and its dependent claims, are allowable over *Bigi*, and over the other art applied against the claims in the Office Action (U.S. Patent Application Publications 2003/0043204, of Aguilera et al., and 2007/0139526, of Parulski et al.).

Claim 1 is directed to a camera which is capable of directly transmitting a digital image to a printer. The claimed camera comprises an obtaining unit that obtains capability information including information from the printer. According to Claim 1, the capability information includes information indicating what type of the trimming print method the printer has. A user interface selector selects, based on the capability information, a user interface for controlling a trimming print method that can be used in the printer, and a display unit displays the user interface selected by the user interface selector.

Bigi relates to a printer driver for providing stapling position options for computer-generated printed documents. In *Bigi*, a user is provided with a view of a sheet of paper on the computer screen, and can select with the mouse where he or she wants the staples to be put. The printer driver acquires paper size, feed orientation and image

orientation, and maps the user's selected staple positions to the physical capabilities of the printer. Fig. 3 of *Bigi* depicts a user interface screen for selecting a printer, and Figs. 4A and 5A depict a user interface screen for designating staple positions.

Applicant submits, however, that nothing has been found in *Bigi* that would teach or suggest a camera having an obtaining unit like that recited in Claim 1, that obtains capability information of a printer, where that capability information "includes information indicating what type of trimming print method the printer has". Since no such obtaining unit is present, *Bigi* also does not have or suggest the recited selection capability, since that capability depends on information obtained by the recited obtaining unit. Also, since *Bigi* does not relate to a camera, nothing therein is believed to suggest the recited display unit, which displays "displays to the user of said camera the user interface selected by said user interface selector".

For these reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over *Bigi*.

Aguilera relates to a user interface for the simultaneous actuation of multiple duplicators (including within this term analog and digital office copiers, videocassette recorders, microfilm and microfiche writers, and others, see paragraph [0002]; cameras however do not appear to be included). Fig. 3 of *Aguilera* depicts a menu page 300 displayed on a display screen of a host computer 102. The display screen includes two dialog boxes 302, 318 for selecting the duplicator network resources and buttons (in dialog boxes 314, 332) of various properties of duplicator network resources 108-130.

Again, nothing has been found in this document that would teach or suggest the recited camera having an obtaining unit that obtains capability information including

information about the trimming method available in a printer, as recited in Claim 1, much less a unit that makes a selection of an interface based on the obtaining of such information. And since *Aguilera* does not appear to relate to cameras, there is also no display unit in it that displays information to the user of a camera. Even if this document is combined with *Bigi*, therefore, the result would not have or suggest any of these three features of Claim 1.

Parulski '526 relates to a digital camera 10 providing image processing for an attachable printer 30. The printer 30 stores variable parameters in a variable parameter table 46. If the digital camera 10 request and accepts the variable parameters from the printer 30, the camera 10 stores in a local parameter memory 22 of the camera 10. When an image in a volatile memory 14 of the camera 10 is selected for printing, an image processor 18 of the camera 10 processes the selected image using the parameters stored in the parameter memory 22. The processed image data is transmitted to the printer 30 to print the image (see paragraphs [0024] and [0025]). Further, the digital camera 10 displays a graphical user interface on a color LCD 332 of the camera 10. The graphical user interface, however, does not include multiple items related to print functions.

Even if *Parulski* '526 is combined with *Bigi* and *Aguilera*, however, Applicant submits that nothing in the result would teach or suggest an obtaining unit that obtains from a printer capability information that includes information indicating what type of the trimming print method the printer has. Still less would anything in the those documents, taken separately or together, teach or suggest the recited user interface selector, which according to Claim 1 selects a user interface for controlling a trimming print method

that can be used in the printer, based on the capability information obtained by the obtaining unit.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over those documents, taken separately or in any possible combination.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against independent Claim 1, and that claim is therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

Claims 7 and 8 are each dependent from Claim 1, and are believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P. Diana/

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS_WS 2537297v1